

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the April 2, 2009 Final Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the claims. This Amendment B amends claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 27, 33, 38, and 41 and cancels claims 17 and 18.

Claims 1-16 and 19-46 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, and 19-23

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, and 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693 to Hansen et al. (Hansen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,513,342 to Leong et al (Leong). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

A1. Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a system for sizing a tile on a computer display. Features of the system provide for both automatic and manual resizing of tiles. In particular, features of the system, "allow both [an] application to choose its own size and allow users to override that size." (Application, page 2, lines 24-25). Accordingly, the system "makes it possible to build tiles that use an appropriate amount of space, wherein users are able to stop poorly designed tiles from taking up too much space." (Application, page 2, lines 25-27).

The system of claim 1 includes "an automatic sizing routine for automatically sizing the tile responsive to a change in tile content during an automatic mode" and "a manual sizing routine which allows a user to manually set the size of the tile during a

manual mode." "[T]he tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile." "[A]fter the user manually sets the size of the tile the manual mode is entered during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in tile content is restricted."

As amended, claim 1 highlights that the system is configured to operate in **both** an automatic mode and a manual mode for resizing the tile. In particular, the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manual sets the size of the tile and then the tile is operated in the manual mode.

As discussed below, the cited references fail to disclose a system which has both an automatic mode and a manual mode for sizing a tile. Hansen merely discloses a system in which the tiles can be manually resized individually or as a group. The Office suggests that Hansen teaches the automatic sizing routine of the claim 10 by teaching that the panels located within the dashboard interface as proportionately resized when the user resizes the dashboard interface. Specifically, the Office points to Hansen at col. 6, lines 35-39 which teaches "[a]s the vertical size of dashboard interface 10 changes, rows of dates are added to or subtracted from calendar 140. For example, when cursor 56 and mouse 60 are used to increase the size of dashboard interface 10, an additional row of dates are added to calendar 140, as shown in FIG. 27." In other words, Hansen merely teaches that the user can manually set the entire panel interfaces using one sizing operation to the interface shell, rather than automatically sizing/resizing the tile. Furthermore, as correctly noted by the Office, the ability of a user to resize a group tiles together fails to disclose "an automatic sizing routine for automatically sizing the tile responsive to a change in tile content during an automatic mode" as recited by claim 1. (Office action, page 3)

Additionally, even if Hansen could be interpreted to teach the automatic sizing routine of claim 1, Hansen fails to teach or suggest a manual mode during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in tile content is restricted. The Office points out that Hansen teaches that the user interface graphic display shell includes a resource panel display which "is displayed within graphic boundaries of the user interface graphic display shell at a screen region which maintains a user-specified position relative to said vertical row of application program panel displays." (Office action, page 3 citing

Hansen at col. 8, lines 34-37). However, Hansen merely teaches that the position, not the size, of the resource panel display is maintained within interface graphic display shell. Thus, Hansen fails to teach or suggest a "manual mode . . . during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in content is restricted" as recited by claim 1.

Furthermore, even if Hansen could be interpreted to teach the automatic mode and the manual mode of claim 1, Hansen still fails to teach or suggest that "the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile" and "after the user manually sets the size of the tile the manual mode is entered" as recited by claim 1. For example, nothing in Hansen suggests that after a panel within the dashboard interface is individually sized, that it will remain that size even when the entire dashboard interface is re-sized by the user.

Leong fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen. Leong merely teaches a "software presentation system [that] automatically adjusts window size and positioning in accordance with window environment changes." In particular, Leong teaches that the size of a child window is automatically resized in response to the following changes:

- "1. A change in the font used by a child window. The font size may be changed by either the end user or the application that is displaying the window.
2. A change in the data displayed by the child window which causes the child window to need more or less space in the canvas window.
3. A change in the size of a neighboring child window, if the change requires the canvas window to resize other child windows to maintain visual relationships.
4. A change in the size of the canvas window itself, where the canvas window includes child windows whose sizes are to be synchronized with the canvas window." (Leong, col. 3, lines 41-55).

Accordingly, Leong, teaches only one mode of operation in which the window size is automatically adjusted. Thus, Leong fails to teach a manual mode. More particularly, Leong, like Hansen fails to teach a "manual mode . . . during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in content is restricted" as recited by claim 1.

Moreover, even if Hansen could be interpreted to teach the manual mode of claim 1 and Leong could be interpreted to teach the automatic mode of claim 1, the combined system still fails to include the elements of claim 1 which recite that "the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile" and "after the user manually sets the size of the tile the manual mode is entered." Instead the

combined system could merely be selected to resize the tiles in either the automatic mode or the manual mode rather than selectively operating between the two modes based on the user's interaction with the size of the tile.

In view of the foregoing, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

A2. Claim 8

Claim 8 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for sizing a tile. The computer-readable medium includes "an automatic sizing component for automatically sizing the tile responsive to a change in tile content during an automatic mode" and "a manual sizing component for allowing a user to manually size the tile during a manual mode." "[T]he tile is operated in the automatic mode until the manual sizing component is used, said use of the manual sizing component places the tile in the manual mode." "[W]hen the tile is in the manual mode, the tile is restricted from being automatically resized."

As discussed above, neither Hansen nor Leong, together or in combination teach "when the tile is in the manual mode, the tile is restricted from being automatically resized." Further even if Hansen could be interpreted to teach such a manual mode of claim 8 and Leong could be interpreted to teach the automatic mode of claim 8, the combined invention still fails to include the elements of claim 8 which recite that "the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the manual sizing component is used, said use of the manual sizing component places the tile in the manual mode."

Accordingly, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend

directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 8 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 8 is allowable.

A3. Claim 15

Claim 15 is directed to a system for resizing a tile on a display. The system includes, in part, "a first routine for automatically resizing the tile responsive to a change in tile content during an automatic mode, wherein user approval is required to resize the tile above a predefined maximum size." The system also includes "a second routine for allowing a user to manually resize the tile during a manual mode." "[T]he tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile or the user declines a request to automatically resize the tile above the predefined maximum size." "[A]fter the user manually sets the size of the tile or the user declines a request to automatically resize the tile above the predefined maximum size the manual mode is entered during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in tile content is restricted."

In additions to the features discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 8, Hansen and Leong are both entirely silent as to obtaining user approval to resize a tile above a predefined maximum size. Thus, whether read alone or in combination, Hansen and Leong additionally fail to teach or suggest the elements of claim 15 which teach "the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile or the user declines a request to automatically resize the tile above the predefined maximum size."

Accordingly, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 15 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 15 is allowable.

A4. Claim 20

Claim 20 is directed to a method for sizing a tile. The method includes "initially setting the tile in an automatic mode," "automatically sizing the tile responsive to a change in tile content during the automatic mode," and "allowing a user to manually set the size of the tile." The method includes "resetting the tile from the automatic mode to a manual mode when the user manually sets the size of the tile," "wherein while the tile is in the manual mode, preventing the tile from being automatically resized."

As discussed above, neither Hansen nor Leong, together or in combination teach "while the tile is in the manual mode, preventing the tile from being automatically resized." Further even if Hansen could be interpreted to teach such a manual mode of claim 20 and Leong could be interpreted to teach the automatic mode of claim 20, the combined invention still fails to a method that "reset[s] the tile from the automatic mode to a manual mode when the user manually sets the size of the tile."

Accordingly, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 20 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 20 is allowable.

B. Claims 27-31, 33, 34, 38-41, 42, and 46

Claims 27-31, 33, 34, 38-41, 42, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693 to Hansen et al. (Hansen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,363,481 to Tilt (Tilt). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

B1. Claim 27

Claim 27 is directed to a method for sizing a tile on a display. The method includes "providing the tile on the display, said tile displaying first content" and "automatically resizing the tile a plurality of times based at least in part on changes in the

first content." "[T]he automatic resizing of the tile is permitted when a time differential between a first resizing event and a second resizing event is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise." The method includes providing the resized tile on the display, said resized tile displaying second content.

The Office correctly notes that Hansen fails to teach that "automatic resizing of the tile is permitted when a time differential between a first resizing event and a second resizing event is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise." (Office action, page 6).

Tilt fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen. Tilt merely teaches a timer that is used to close an open window. As cited by the Office, Tilt teaches "[w]hen a knob, used to scroll through a menu, is activated or turned the menu appears. A timer with a user preset time limit is started. As long as the knob is being turned the timer is reset. While the knob is being turned different parameters are not only highlighted, as is done in present systems, but also magnified. If the knob is not being turned, then the time limit expires. When the time limit expires, the last highlighted parameter is selected and the menu closes." In other words, when the user is not turning the knob, the timer begins to run, and when the timer expires, the menu is closed.

Thus, nothing in Tilt teaches or suggests that the timer is used to control the resizing of a window. As amended, claim 27 highlights that the resized tile displays content and thus does not include closing the tile ("providing the resized tile on the display, said resized tile displaying second content"). As such Tilt, like Hansen, fails to teach or suggest "automatic resizing of the tile is permitted when a time differential between a first resizing event and a second resizing event is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise" as recited by claim 27.

In view of the foregoing, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 27. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 27 are

allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claim from which they depend is allowable.

B2. Claims 33 and 41

Claim 33 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer executable components for sizing a tile. Claim 41 is directed to a system for resizing a tile on a computer display. Claims 33 and 41 each specify that "the automatic resizing of the tile is permitted when a time differential between a first resizing event and a second resizing event is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise." Like claim 27, claims 33 and 41 have both been amended to clarify that the resized tile displays content. Specifically, the claims recite "said resized tile displaying second content."

Thus, for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 27, Hansen and Tilt, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claims 33 and 41. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claims 33 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 33 and 41, respectively, are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable.

C. Claims 6-7, 10-11, 17-18, and 24-26

Claims 6-7, 10-11, 17-18, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693 to Hansen et al. (Hansen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,513,342 to Leong et al (Leong) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,758 to Nielsen et al (Nielsen). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Claims 17-18 have been canceled. Claims 6-7; 10-11; and 24-26 depend from amended independent claims 1, 8, and 20, respectively, and add further limitations to those in claims 1, 8, and 20. As such, Applicants submit that claims 6-7, 10-11, and 24-

26 are allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claims 1, 8, and 20 are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant wishes to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. Bain/

Robert M. Bain, Reg. No. 36,736
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 231-5400

NAS/FRA/RMB